DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 086 054 HE 004 953

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Bender, Louis W.; Simmons, Howard L. |
| TITLE | One Dupont Circle: National Influence Center for Higher Education? |
| INSTITUTION | Florida State Univ., Tallahassee. Coll. of Education. |
| PUB DATE | Nov 73 |
| NOTE | 71p. |
| AVAILABLE FROM | College of Education, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida ($2.50). |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29 |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Group Structure; *Higher Education; *National Organizations; *Organizations (Groups); *Professional Associations |
| IDENTIFIERS | *National Center for Higher Education |

ABSTRACT

The National Center for Higher Education, located at One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C., has been perceived by many as a focus of power and influence for higher education. At the same time, expectations of members of the organizations have evolved because of such a power image. Thus, a dilemma may unfold whereby members expect output from their national organizations that cannot be delivered. The importance of a more accurate perspective of the nature and scope of responsibilities of the national organizations can benefit both the organizations and their memberships. This study deals with the fact that no one center can be the single influence or source for education. Higher education is too diverse, too competitive, and too large to be represented in any central manner. An initial requirement is for a correct perception of the role of national organizations as part of a total enterprise. With a correct perception, constituencies can lead to positive influence on given issues or causes. It is to that objective that this study has been directed. This document provides a look at the organizations at the National Center, their internal workings, and how they are viewed by others. (Author/PG)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 086054

# ONE DUPONT CIRCLE: NATIONAL INFLUENCE CENTER FOR HIGHER EDUCATION?

by

Louis W. Bender
Howard L. Simmons

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 004953

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
Florida State University

ED 086054

# ONE DUPONT CIRCLE:
# NATIONAL INFLUENCE CENTER
# FOR
# HIGHER EDUCATION?

by

Louis W. Bender

and

Howard L. Simmons

Division of Education Management Systems
College of Education
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida
November, 1973

A publication of the
Center for State and Regional Leadership
(Florida State University/University of Florida)
Funded by a Grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation

# PREFACE

One of the generalizations related to inter-human relationships has been the statement, "What one perceives a situation to be, may be more important than what it actually is." The phenomenon of perceptions is mysterious and complex. Individuals or groups can be led subtly to perceive a given situation in a totally different manner or over a period of time they may even come to a perception without any overt or covert effort or action by any external source. The fact remains, however, people can develop expectations as a consequence of the perceptions they have come to accept.

The National Center for Higher Education, located at One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C., has been perceived by many as a central focus of power and influence for higher education. At the same time, expectations of constituent members of the various organizations have evolved because of such a power image. Thus, a dilemma may unfold whereby dues paying members expect output from their national organizations which cannot be delivered. The importance of a more accurate perspective of the nature and scope of responsibilities of the national organizations can benefit both the organizations and their memberships.

At this time in the history of higher education, the rapidity of change, the pyramiding of new and complex impingements, and the uncertainty of future circumstances stimulate a need for some degree of stability. Yet change is constant. Even some of the associations located at One Dupont Circle have moved toward embracing the concept of post-secondary education with all of the various delivery systems such a term connotes. This is a break from the traditional domain identified with "higher education."

At times the simple, the obvious, is hidden because of the complexity of human enterprise. This study deals with one of those obvious facts. No one center (whether a physical building such as One Dupont Circle or even a unified group of voluntary organizations) can be the single influence source for education. Higher education is too diverse, too competing, and too large to be represented in any central manner. Yet the perception of One Dupont Circle as the national influence center may be more important than the fact just stated. Should Congress come to perceive it as <u>the</u> center of influence, then great leverage could be exerted on legislation and appropriations. Yet, on the other hand, should such a single center experience disfavor in the eyes of the Congress, then the total higher education community would bear the burden of inaction or repressive legislative action.

An initial requirement is for a correct perception of the role of national organizations as part of a total

enterprise. With a correct perception, orchestrated efforts of cooperation among the organizations and their various constituencies can lead to positive influence on given issues or causes. It is to that objective that this study has been directed.

This monograph was produced by the FSU/UF Center for State and Regional Leadership supported in part by a grant by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. The FSU/UF Center is concerned with leadership development and action research which relates to state, regional and national coordination of post-secondary education.

We wish to acknowledge with deep appreciation the willingness of Dr. Alan E. Bayer, Professor of Sociology at FSU and formerly a staff member of the American Council on Education, to read the manuscript prior to publication for any factual inaccuracies. We also thank Dr. Richard C. Richardson, Jr., President of Northampton County Area Community College and Dr. James L. Wattenbarger, Director of the Institute for Higher Education at the University of Florida for their suggestions and technical advice. Both have served on many commissions and boards of some of the associations located at One Dupont Circle.

Louis W. Bender
Professor of Higher Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| PREFACE . . . . . | iii |
| INTRODUCTION . . . . . | 1 |
| CHAPTER I . . . . . | 5 |
| One Dupont Circle: The National Influence Center for Higher Education | |
| CHAPTER II . . . . . | 11 |
| Nature of Organizations | |
| Chapter III . . . . . | 21 |
| One Dupont Circle: A Look Inside | |
| Section I. Internal Groups | |
| Section II. Internal Coordination | |
| Section III. Constituency Views | |
| CHAPTER IV . . . . . | 39 |
| One Dupont Circle: Others Look In | |
| Section I. Congressional Views | |
| Section II. Federal Agency Views | |
| Section III. Constituency Views | |
| CHAPTER V . . . . . | 53 |
| One Dupont Circle: A Clear Perspective | |
| REFERENCES . . . . . | 61 |
| NOTES ON THE AUTHORS . . . . . | 65 |

# INTRODUCTION

From a historical perspective, interest on the part of educators "to promote their cause" in Washington was evidenced in the early efforts of Henry Barnard of Connecticut, who convinced the U. S. Bureau of Census in 1840 to collect statistics on education. With the subsequent establishment of a "Department of Education" (now Office of Education), there was a "voice" for those in education. This new agency, established under the Organic Act in 1865, was "to show the condition and progress of education and to otherwise promote the cause of education."

The establishment of this agency also provided for the first federal involvement in education which was -- and to some degree, still is -- looked upon by many as "federal control." The fear of a national ministry of education is credited with the omission of education from the U. S. Constitution, thus placing it within the authority of each state. For that reason, Henry Barnard -- appointed the first commissioner of education -- got less than full cooperation from the educators themselves. And for awhile, it appeared as if the agency might go under. Even though the agency can be credited with some important accomplishments today, there is still fear by some that the federal

government exerts too much influence over education. Because of these fears, real or imagined, all segments of education, including higher education, have formed independent or voluntary associations in order "to promote their own cause(s)."

This study is concerned with the question of the extent to which One Dupont Circle, popularly known as The National Center for Higher Education (NCHE), exerts influence upon the legislative, executive, and bureaucratic processes affecting or effecting higher education policies and organization. More specifically, it attempts to assess the perceived effectiveness of the myriad organizations and associations which make up the complex in functioning as a Washington-based influence center. The study was designed to solicit critical comments of selected paid association executives, several federal agency officials, various congressional leaders and congressional aides, some prominent leaders in higher education and a number of headquarters personnel at One Dupont Circle. In addition, an extensive search of the literature was used to relate theory and research findings essential to a study such as this.

Without the cooperation and interest of the individuals interviewed during the study, much of what has been culled from the literature would lose its significance and impact. Because all individuals involved in the interview process were extremely knowledgeable and experienced, the

concept of elite interviewing was utilized. Such a procedure allowed for freedom in expressing their ideas without the constraint of unnecessary structure, which is the usual practice when the investigator must standardize the interview procedures. Specifically, Dexter's concept allowed the interviewees to give their own definitions of what was -- in their opinion -- relevant to this study.[1]

Even though the interviews provided the core information for a large portion of the study, we gratefully acknowledge the importance of unpublished documents (commissioned by the NCHE) dealing with the topic of this study and made available for examination as "internal documents" by several executives at One Dupont Circle.

It may be worthwhile to discuss briefly what developments could lead a priori to the examination of One Dupont Circle as a "National Influence Center." Higher education is experiencing "a new depression." Although Earl Cheit in his book on the new depression was fundamentally concerned with the financial or economic state of higher education, he, too, was focusing upon the decline in prestige and influence of the higher education establishment.[2] Nothing perhaps figures more prominently as the central representative of this "establishment" than the Washington-based higher education associations and organizations which make up the National Center for Higher Education at One Dupont Circle. Consequently, One Dupont Circle must share the burden of improving the image and

assisting in the continuing development of higher education policy at the national level.

What, then, would be some of the precipitating factors supportive of a study as this one? First and foremost is the question as to who can and will do the better job at governmental relations, individual institutions or their respective Washington-based associations, or both. Secondly, and most obviously, the pressure for funds has caused many institutions to re-evaluate their role in association activities. There is a concern over the real effectiveness as well as over duplication of effort among associations with overlapping memberships. Finally, and inextricably related to the first two, there is the reality that if One Dupont Circle did not stand as an influence center for higher education, outside of the federal government, some other group no doubt would. Such is the nature of organizational dynamics. A separate chapter has been devoted to this issue.

# CHAPTER I

## One Dupont Circle:
## The National Center for Higher Education

The strikingly beautiful eight-story triangular building located at One Dupont Circle consumes one of ten protruding peninsulars between the ten avenues leading as spokes of a wheel to the hub of the Circle. The modern edifice of marble and glass prominently conveys an image of beauty, creativity, expertise, and power. While coincidental, it is perhaps appropriate that the nearly four acres of circular park within Dupont Circle is maintained by the National Park Service as a National Park. In such a setting, the site of The National Center for Higher Education represents a monument to the past achievements and contributions of higher education to our society while the modern architecture signifies the future as well as the dynamic potential of the associations and organizations representing nearly every segment and area of higher education.

The American Council on Education (ACE), the umbrella organization and titular head of higher education institutions and organizations, assumed leadership in acquiring

the building and securing foundation support for its purchase. A brochure describes some of the objectives of ACE in proposing the new Center:

> An intangible value fully as important as the services available is that the new Center will symbolize the unity of higher education. With the increasing involvement of the federal government in matters educational, it is more important than ever before for institutions of learning to be in effective communication with each other and to be well organized for the voluntary enterprise aspects of unified action.[3]

This quotation was an excerpt of a letter addressed to the W. K. Kellogg Foundation for the major grant that foundation made to acquire the new structure. It was reported in a brochure describing the National Center for Higher Education.

The same document describes some of the historical objectives of the American Council of Education to bring unity to higher education. Samuel P. Capen, ACE's first full-time chief executive is quoted to have given the reason in 1919 for ACE's existence as:

> The development of the American educational scheme has been planless, haphazard. We have always suffered because of this planlessness. The price that we are called upon to pay for our lack of forethought and the consequent lack of system becomes heavier every year. Unified action has always been impossible because there was no unifying agency. There has been no means even to create a consensus of opinion. A unifying agency has now at last been established. To stimulate discussion, to focus opinion, and in the end to bring about joint action on major matters of educational policy--

> these are the things The American Council on Education was created to do. . . This is the justification for the Council's existence, or there is none.[4]

In this quotation we have the seed for one of the major perceptions which One Dupont Circle has generated. Whether faculty member, administrator, trustee, bureaucrat, congressman, or graduate student, the connotation that One Dupont Circle is the unifying force or center for action representing higher education at the national level has come about. The new Center is not viewed as the site of the American Council on Education in the singular sense.

The name, National Center for Higher Education, even the building, has come to symbolize, whether correctly or incorrectly, the aura of influence and power for all of higher education. The mystique of the address has led to popular slogans by educators in the field who have described it as the "national influence center for higher education." It has been perceived as the place to turn for information and wisdom, a place to respect and be proud of, a place to combine energies in matters of mutual concern, and a place of the dynamic power represented by the enterprise of distinguished universities, graduate centers, research centers, state colleges and universities, private colleges and universities, two-year colleges, and a variety of special interest professional organizations serving trustees, administrators, faculty, counselors, students, and alumni.

Prior to its existence, there had been no central location to house most of the associations and organizations. For good or ill, One Dupont Circle is perceived by many both in and out of higher education as an influence center, notwithstanding the quantity and quality of services provided to constituencies and publics represented by the various tenants of the building.

In order to gain a perspective of the various associations and organizations housed in the NCHE, it is appropriate and useful to list them here. Any examination of the list demonstrates the wide variety of groups, the overlapping of memberships and sub-groups which have grown out of larger associations, and the latent potential for competition or conflicting interests represented by the nature of the organization itself. (Table I)

It is important to note that while most of the national higher education groups are represented in this list, not all national organizations concerned with higher education are physically housed at the Center. Less than half of the post-secondary educational associations recognized by the U. S. Office of Education are even located in Washington.[5] Other Washington residents concerned with various aspects of higher education but located elsewhere include: The American Association of University Women (AAUW), The Association of American Colleges (AAC), The Asso ation of Jesuit Colleges and Universities (AJCU), The Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT), The Editorial Projects

TABLE I

One Dupont Circle Residents
(National Center for Higher Education)

American Alumni Council (AAC)
American Association for Higher Education (AAHE)
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE)
American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO)
American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC)
American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU)
American Association of University Professors (AAUP)
American College Public Relations Association (ACPRA)
American College Testing Program (ACT)
American Council on Education (ACE)
American Society for Engineering Education (ASEE)
Association of Academic Health Centers (AAHC)
Association of American Law Schools (AALS)
Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC)
Association of American Universities (AAU)
Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGBUC)
Association of Schools of Allied Health Professions (ASAHP)
Association of University Programs in Hospital Administration (AUPHA)
College and University Personnel Association (CUPA)
Cooperative College Registry (CCR)
Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges (CASC)
Council of Graduate Schools in the United States (CGSUS)
Council on Library Resources, Incorporated
Educational Testing Service (ETS)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) for Higher Education
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) for Teacher Education
Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions on Higher Education (FRACHE)
Gerontological Society
Higher Education Administration Referral Service
Jossey-Bass Publishers
Midwestern Colleges Office
National Association of College and University Business Officers
National Association of College and University Attorneys
National Association of Schools of Art
National Association of Schools of Music
National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULC)
National Catholic Educational Association
National Commission on Accrediting (NCA)
National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities
National University Extension Association (NUEA)
University of Oklahoma

for Education (EPE), The National Education Association (NEA), The National Association of College and University Administrators (NACUA), The National Association of Women Deans and Counselors (NAWDC), and The National Society of Professors (NSP).

This monograph attempts to address a number of questions which grow out of the perception of One Dupont Circle which seems to have evolved:

1. Is One Dupont Circle actually the influence center for higher education? Should it be?
2. What internal organization exists to assure communications and unified efforts on the part of the diverse group of tenants?
3. What are the perceptions of paid executive directors and staff members of the associations and organizations toward One Dupont Circle as an influence center?
4. What are the perceptions of congressional leaders and their support staff concerning One Dupont Circle as an influence center?
5. What are the perceptions of federal agency officials toward One Dupont Circle?
6. What are the perceptions of constituent dues paying members of organizations and associations located at One Dupont Circle?
7. What theories of organization, their nature and characteristics, might apply to an analysis of One Dupont Circle as a national center?

Subsequent chapters are intended to provide snapshots of internal and external views and viewpoints which may assist the reader in formulating some tenative answers to these questions.

## CHAPTER II

### Nature of Organizations

No study of the National Center for Higher Education and its occupants could be very meaningful or complete without some discussion of the nature of organizations with special emphasis upon voluntary associations. Since virtually all of the resident groups at One Dupont Circle are classified as such, it is encumbent upon us to provide relevant data about the nature, role and advantages of voluntary organizations.

A voluntary organization comes about when those having common goals or interests decide to pursue their objective through collective efforts. They exist so long as they fulfill the desires of those who comprise and support them. Furthermore, the collective attitudes represented by the group set the direction and orientation toward specific goals and objectives. Caplow reported in his study:

> The empirical evidence suggests general tendencies: 1) members of an organization usually evaluate its achievement more highly than non-members, 2) higher status members of an organization usually evaluate its achievement more favorably than lower status members, 3) members of an organizational component usually evaluate its contribution to the total program more favorably than non-members.[6]

A voluntary association is a private not-for-profit organization and may be generally defined as an organization, no part of the income or property of which is distributable to its members, directors, or officers. The prohibition against distribution of a part of the income or property to officers does not prevent the payment of compensation to officers and employees for services. Neither does the definition prevent an organization from rendering services to its members. On the other hand, certain services rendered to members will disqualify the corporation for exemption under the federal income tax law. The pertinent regulation is section 1.501(c)(3)-1.[7]

The implications and possible broader application of this I.R.S. Code as it applies to the Washington-based higher education association will be discussed in a subsequent section of this study.

As Pennock suggests in his book Voluntary Associations, there may be two basic principles which cause associations to be formed or held together. These two principles can be briefly summarized as (1) a shared commitment and (2) the legal principle. The former is self-explanatory and the latter indicated that the association is held together and enabled to function by formal rules of duty and entitlement.[8] Pennock elaborates further by stating that

> ...in an association formally dedicated to the achievement of some stated end, the strongest element of commitment may not be in the end itself, but in a belief in the efficacy of the means pursued.[9]

Consequently, as with most human associations the two principles given above stand in a relation of polarity, i.e., they fight and reinforce each other at the same time. When there is a shift occuring in the balance between them, such shifting may both cause and reflect corresponding shifting in the quality of the human relationships encompassed by the two principles.[10] In other words, when all goes well with an association, it is usually difficult to say how much its success depends upon a sense of shared commitment and how much is attributable to a well-designed internal legal structure. But when trouble does develop and a schism occurs, the latent tension between the two principles may come plainly into view.

For purposes of this study of the influence of a group of higher education organizations, let us agree that in the absence of centralized authority, voluntary associations provide direction in American higher education. More specifically, it can be said the primary purpose of an association is to attempt to accomplish what individual members or associates can not do alone -- or do better and at less cost than the individual members can do. As a recent evaluation report by the American Society of Association Executives reiterates:

> Associations came into existence because of common problems, interests, and needs of members. Members are attracted initially and are willing to pay their dues and become heavily involved, so long as the problems are solved and needs are met.

> But if needs are not met, they drop out. Sometimes, part of the membership splinters off and forms its own group because needs were not fully met in the old....[11]

This is reinforcement of the idea of the shared commitment and legal principles described earlier by Pennock. Obviously, then, the distinct advantages of voluntary associations can be to 1) get a view of the larger picture, 2) provide a sense of group solidarity-the desire for acceptance and the fear of isolation from a desirable group can provide a unique form of stimulation, and 3) set up the association as a more respectable source of professional pronouncements. As Haas and Drabek have said, "Organizational image building is indeed a significant activity where prestige is concerned."[12]

Another perspective exists, however. Organizations are multi-dimensional. In addition to the external dimension just examined, there is an internal structure represented by the relationships of those who are employed to enable the organization to achieve its objectives. These individuals need to establish lines of communication not only with their constituent members but within their own organization.

Such internal communications initially are intended to advance the best interests of the organization in achieving its goals. As time goes on, however, concern for the continued existence and welfare of the organization's staff can become a paramount issue. In this situation,

organization executives and their staffs come to view themselves as "the association," thus ignoring the membership constituencies which make the real association. Organizational affairs, even priorities, thus often become dominated and determined by the staff regardless of whether they agree or complement the concerns and interests of the membership. Organizational theorists and analysts have referred to such situations as the "iron law of oligarchy."[13]

The iron law of oligarchy contributes to a phenomenon associated with Washington based representatives. Often such organizations are more apt to follow traditions and sentiments of Washington at the expense of representing the viewpoint of constituents in different parts of the nation. As a result, executive officers of Washington based organizations sometimes evaluate information in political and policy terms with the view of the future welfare of the organization in mind more than in the achievement of the goals for which the organization was created.

In this situation, the executive director of the Washington based association may develop strategies or procedures designed to achieve goals which are contributory to another problem. The question becomes: Is the organization an employee or tool of constituents or are the constituent members servants of the organization, used as pawns in the chess game of federal affairs and used by

the organization for its own benefit. Efforts to involve member institutions in the lobbying efforts to win congressional action sometimes reveal strategies of Washington organizations which seek congressional pressure to enact laws not beneficial to a given member in different parts of the country. In this situation, loyalty to the organization can be a burdensome pressure for an individual unable to analyze the full implications for his own institution or professional groups which the proposed legislation might have. The Washington based organization, because of its strategic location in having access to all information, can use its members without interpreting the full significance of the desired action.

Louis A. Dexter in a book entitled How Organizations Are Represented in Washington, uses the term "Washington Representative" instead of lobbyist and suggests that whether an organization or an individual, such representatives "permit big government in a diversified society to adapt, to communicate, to coordinate...(while making) it easier for particular groups to be heard, to communicate, to adjust."[14]

In providing for a viable government relations program an organization should, in Dexter's view, be planned and designed to work with the Congress, with the executive departments, with the White House, with the regulatory agencies, and with the federal courts.[15] Hence, if One Dupont Circle were to be the national influence center

for higher education, it would be anticipated that a united program would develop directed toward these various branches of government. Yet, an examination of the political process demonstrates that various channels exist for influencing government and a variety of access routes must be contemplated in any plan of action. The American system provides for multiple tracks for getting things done legislatively, a virtue and a burden.

It is appropriate here to call attention to the not-for-profit nature of the voluntary organizations and their vulnerability to the IRS code concerning lobbying. The corporate exemption from federal income tax law would be lost for tenants of One Dupont Circle if they were perceived as Washington-based lobbyists. In addition to the obvious financial disaster of such an interpretation, many associations wish to avoid the stigma of being labled as lobbying groups. This activity has historically been too vulnerable to the seamy side of bribery, kick-backs, and other unethical practices.

Another image organizations need to avoid stems from the funding sources. When they turn to federal agencies or foundations as additional sources over and above the income from membership dues, organizations are in danger of being viewed as more loyal to the federal or foundation wishes than to the sponsor membership.

When the Nixon Administration called on Congress to cut the education budget in 1970, the creation of The

Emergency Committee for Full Funding of Education demonstrated several points. In the first place, the Emergency Committee enabled the Washington-based organizations to avoid the stigma and the possible IRS determination or classification of lobbying. Another motive of the separate committee was, perhaps, the opportunity for different and sometimes conflicting interest groups to work together for a common cause without surrendering any special organizational prerogatives.

Another final observation should be made in studying the nature of organizations. They have the tendency to evolve a status hierarchy in the same manner society has persisted in having different social classes. The size of an organization, the prestige of the membership of an organization, the wealth of an organization, or the tradition of an organization may contribute to it being distinguished from others with high status and potent influence. Executive directors of such organizations often benefit by some of the elite status rubbing off on them in the eyes of the public. As a result, a hierarchy of executive officers contributes to the image of an influence center on the one hand while explaining one of the reasons individual organizations or associations sometimes wish to "go it alone" out of fear of unfavorable competition.

Before concluding this examination of organizations, it is appropriate to examine the nature of multi-organizational systems. One Dupont Circle must be viewed as such

a system which necessarily must accommodate various requirements of its subsystem members. Some members expect the system to serve the major function of protection of one member from another. Jurisdictional disputes and other alleged intrusions upon each other's domain are frequently the focus for such expected action. It can be assumed that some of the associations feel obligated to become a member of the multi-organization system for just such protection against being swallowed up by a larger association.

Another purpose of the multi-organizational system, of course, can be image building, lobbying, monitoring of events and economies derived from consolidated support services and purchasing practices. Haas and Drabek observe: "It is little wonder ... that the decision making and coordination devices within these supra-organizations are highly varied and therefore difficult to describe in any summary fashion."[16] The same authors observe another phenomenon:

> One interesting way to compare the various multi-organizational systems is to consider the extent to which a typical member organization is able to attain control over the activities of the larger systems. . . . Here, a limited number of organizations mutually agree on some set of activities that they want carried out. . . . Once this system has been set in motion, however, the amount of control by any member may begin to vary. . . . Now the system members who consistently have the greatest interaction with the central staff will retain a higher level of control than will those who fail to keep up such monitoring. Member organizations

> located in the same community as the central staff have an advantage in this regard. Physical proximity is an aid to surveillance.[17]

Whether we apply the latter principle to the internal structure of One Dupont Circle or its relationship to the legislative and executive branches of federal government, we can see several aspects revealed in the day to day operations of the constituent associations as well as the National Center for Higher Education as an entity itself.

## CHAPTER III

### One Dupont Circle: A Look Inside

The purpose of this chapter is to present a picture of the different tenants of One Dupont Circle, the mechanism used to provide for internal coordination, and the view of some staff members concerning the NCHE as a national influence center.

### Section I. Internal Groups

An examination of the titles of the organizations listed in Chapter I as occupants of One Dupont Circle is bound to produce an observation that a wide variety of higher education institutions, professional groups, and related interests are represented. A careful examination of the Directory in the lobby of One Dupont Circle would add further insight into the sometimes complementary and at other times competing nature of the associations and organizations residing there. Finally, an analysis of the stated purposes of the different organizations would demonstrate overlapping or competing interests as well.

The occupant at the "top" (8th floor) is the American Council on Education. The stated purpose of ACE today is not different from when Samuel P. Capen spoke in 1919. It

is a council of national and regional education associations and institutions headed by Roger W. Heyns, formerly Chancellor of the University of California, Berkeley who states:

> The Council can serve this broad purpose through three principal roles, apart from its provision of informational, research, training, and other services to the higher education community: (1) as catalyst in the development of policy and appropriate practice within higher education; (2) as counselor to and bridge between all branches of government and higher education in the development of public policy; as the developer of consensus and as the spokesman for the academic community; and (3) as interpreter of the educational community to the nation as a whole.[18]

The other association primarily concerned with global aspects of higher education, the American Association for Higher Education, occupies part of the seventh floor. While ACE has an institutional membership base, the AAHE "is unique among higher education associations in that its membership is open to faculty, administrators, graduate students, and others with a major interest in higher education." While its purpose is the improvement of higher education, obviously its individual membership base can put it in occasional conflict with the institution-based ACE objectives.

Because of the prestige, size and broad-reaching impact of these two organizations, it is assumed that on issues in higher education which are universal, they will

be the respected organizations and will use their unique qualities to win support from government or philanthropic sources. Despite the earned and unearned criticisms which may have been leveled at these two groups, they are still respected and regarded by many in the profession as the primary guardians of the higher education enterprise. The goals and objectives are broad enough to encompass all facets of higher education even though their membership bases may occasionally put them at odds.

The potential for duplication or competition of interests can be gleaned by examining excerpts of general objectives of a few associations. A brochure of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges reads:

> The Association acts as a catalyst to bring the collective strength of the membership to bear on pressing educational issues which concern them all. It also seeks to focus public attention on the vast contributions that state universities and land grant colleges have made to the nation through the years.[19]

Another association occupying the same floor with NASULGC, The American Association of State Colleges and Universities, includes in its statement of purpose:

> AASCU is the mechanism created by . . . institutions to assist them in meeting their goals and objectives; to provide them with a voice in the development of national policies affecting higher

> education; and to engage in those activities which can be done more effectively on a collective basis than individually.[20]

These two associations champion publicly supported institutions.

On the other hand, two associations sponsored by private institutions share the same suite even though they occasionally may not support the same cause. The National Catholic Education Association (NCEA) is dedicated to strengthening the contribution of Catholic educational institutions. The American Association of Colleges (AAC) also located in suite 770 of One Dupont Circle was founded for the purpose of:

> The promotion of higher education in all its forms in the colleges of Liberal Arts and Sciences which shall become members of the Association, and the prosecution of such plans as may make more efficient the institutions included in its membership.[21]

Both organizations seek to foster greater support for private higher education. Thus they often find themselves shoulder to shoulder seeking Congressional understanding of the effects of legislation upon their constituencies. At other times they may be in subtle or open competition.

While most of the associations state their objectives in broad terms and usually embrace commitment to serve the total institution, some wittingly or unwittingly make it clear a special alliance with the presidents of institutional

members exists. Such is true of the Association of American Universities. In a mimeographed flyer we find the following evidence of that particular stance:

> Traditionally the principal function of the Association has been to facilitate an informal exchange of ideas and experience among the member presidents on matters of mutual interest related to university policy, and to state a public position on matters of high urgency -- such as the federal financing of higher education.[22]

This focus on the primary liaison with presidents is not peculiar to AAU, of course. It derives from the fact that the president traditionally has been viewed as the "representative" of the institution. This common practice, nevertheless, has caused many associations to get an unbalanced picture of campus needs and problems through the eyes of the president, drawing severe criticism from those who have been left out; namely, faculty, students, deans, trustees. It is argued that presidents are responsible for a tunnel-vision perspective evidenced by the policies and actions of several associations at One Dupont Circle. Another problem exists when an association is perceived as having a distorted view of the real institution. If individual associations are to represent all of the institutional constituencies and extend their influence, then there must be, of necessity, a broader input from all segments of the special groups. Consequently, what an association at One Dupont Circle might give as its objective

could become academic since the degree of effectiveness will probably be determined by the perceptions of others, especially the constituents. There has been a clamor for more meaningful involvement within several associations by their constituents.

Two additional illustrations of potential conflicting interests will be given. First, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) with a membership of approximately 90,000 faculty members representing approximately 1800 institutions is generally recognized as the authoritative voice of college faculty. Recently AAUP committed itself to the development of a program of collective bargaining in higher education. On the same floor at One Dupont Circle we find the College and University Personnel Association (CUPA) and the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO). Both of the latter organizations are concerned with personnel administration, labor relations, wages, and finance. They are often in an adversary relationship to the goals of collective bargaining advocated by AAUP.

The final competition illustration can be found in the offices of the American College Testing Program (ACT) and the Educational Testing Service (ETS) which are both located on the third floor. These organizations are concerned with testing and measurement services and are competitors in seeking business from the colleges and universities throughout the country. Finally, the "umbrella"

organization, ACE, is in direct competition with both of these "tenants" through its student market survey services. Furthermore, the ACE recently established an Office on Women in Higher Education in which it partially duplicates efforts of a similar office in the American Association of Colleges (AAC).

Most of the other associations occupying One Dupont Circle serve a particular segment of higher education and a specialized constituency. These are organizations like the AACJC (representing two-year colleges), CGS (representing research universities), CASC (representing small private colleges), AGB (representing trustees), AACTE (representing teacher training institutions), ASEE (representing engineering education), AUPHA (representing programs in hospital administration), NUEA (representing university extension programs), AAMC (representing medical colleges), and AALS (representing law schools). Such a diversity of interest inevitably leads to factionalization. However, because of the very nature of the groups, this is not always considered to be a negative factor. If some larger or different group could have provided the same services, no doubt these separate groups would never have been formed. In like manner, it is to their individual advantage as an agency for their constituencies in Washington to establish relationships with various agency officials who can promote or act favorably upon policies or provisions related to their individual pursuits.

The overlapping membership and duplication of effort apparent among the associations included here can best be explained by the fact that a given institution may be in a position of greater strength as a result of dual or multiple membership in several associations. Universities which are members of the Council of Graduate Schools probably also belong to the AAU, the NASUGLGC, or the AASCU. In addition the same universities probably hold membership in the Association of Governing Boards as well as the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. To be sure, there could be at least a score of other "special purpose" associations at One Dupont Circle to which such an institution might belong.

Section II. Internal Coordination

It is obvious that One Dupont Circle could result in chaotic dissention and conflict unless a deliberate effort were made to deal with the collective aspects of the associations to realize their potential as an influence center. The ACE is, in reality, the central force for maintaining internal continuity and communication. This is not done, however, by edict or proprietorship. An internal coordination mechanism has been conceived to bring continuity and efficient operation.

The functioning of the "macro" organization is dependent upon a superimposed "Secretariat" over the associations themselves which lends a certain degree of unity to the center's raison d'etre.

The "Secretariat" is a cooperative venture to handle internal policy matters and administrative details of common interest to the associations. Membership of the "Secretariat" include representatives of the ACE, AAC, AASCU, AACJC, AAU, NASULGC, NCA, NCEA, CGS, AAHE, AAUP, AACTE, CASC, and AGBUC.

Not all associations at One Dupont Circle are represented on the "Secretariat." The basic rationale was to have only membership-based associations with similar structures. Many of the other groups have subordinate relationships to associations having membership on the "Secretariat." There also had to be some consideration given to the size of this directional committee. Even the size of the "Secretariat" presented obstacles to the real resolution of problems and, as a result, an additional structure was designed.

To handle inter-organizational communications needs, an additional mechanism has been set up in addition to the "Secretariat" in order to deal with common problems. It is the newly formed Coordinating Committee of The American Council on Education. Its membership includes only those large associations with an institutional membership base, i.e., ACE, AAC, AASCU, AACJC, AAU, and NASULGC. Speculation as to the factors precipitating formulation of this group might be the subject of a separate investigation; however, both the coordinating committee and the "Secretariat" meet regularly to discuss issues and problems of

mutual concern and are chaired by the chief executive officer of the American Council on Education. Although a primary objective sought in establishing NCHE was to achieve economies of operation, less than complete success has occurred. Several of the original projects will illustrate this fact.

At one time, it was proposed that a central library resource for One Dupont Circle would be efficient, yet various "tenants" now have their own library. The central service department has proven less than originally envisioned, and the "computer center" has never achieved its potential for serving as a key ingredient for information use. The most successful internal service has been the central building service responsible for custodial and maintenance services. A recently inaugurated newsletter for the center is circulated to keep professional staff members informed on matters concerning the total organization as well as items of interest to a "united voice" for higher education.

Efforts to determine or evaluate the effectiveness of the "Secretariat" and to study relationships existing among the association memberships have been commissioned on at least two occasions. Access to these two unpublished "internal documents" was provided with the understanding that they would not be quoted. For the purpose of this study, it is sufficient to observe that efforts are being made to assess the image and effectiveness of One Dupont

Circle upon Washington agencies, government and Congress as well as upon its sponsoring memberships. Several steps have been taken to respond to identified shortcomings or areas for additional services, however, these two internal documents have not been published or otherwise disseminated. In the judgment of the investigators, the "studies" failed from two standpoints: (1) they were too narrowly focused to be of any real benefit in solving the problems or constructing alternatives, and (2) the researchers seemed to be confused about the role of the ACE in its relationship with other associations at One Dupont Circle. In other words, the ACE seemed to be viewed as the "spokesman agency" rather than one of many associations within the Washington higher education community and located at One Dupont Circle.

Analysis of the minutes of the Coordinating Committee reveals interesting evidence of both positive efforts to collaborate on given issues and other subtle efforts to take advantage of the circumstances for the benefit of a specific association. The minutes of the April 18, 1973 meeting, for example, reflect a report and discussion on federal legislation dealing with four student aide programs: Basic Opportunity Grants (BOG), Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants (SEOG), Work Study (WS) and National Direct Student Loans (NDSL). A concern of the committee was directed toward strategy and a communications network to facilitate rapid transmission of important information

to all institutions concerned. Another item dealt with a possible joint proposal to a foundation for a grant for a five-year longitudinal study of the transfer or the mobile student phenomenon. In this regard, there was evidence that the AACJC, recipient of a grant from the Carnegie Foundation, was assisting the AASCU in applying the same concept for four-year institutions to fund a serviceman's opportunity college (SOC) project. A final item for illustration here dealt with a discussion of strategies for gaining greater public understanding of higher education as well as determination of the extant public attitudes toward higher education. This situation is captured in the comments of a U. S. Office of Education official who stated, "One Dupont Circle as a Center for Influence is about at its lowest level ever." Whether the statement is justified or out of proportion is not as noteworthy as the fact that those responsible for internal direction at One Dupont Circle are aware of such impressions and have taken steps, whether extensive enough or not, to change the situation.

## Section III. Constituency Views

Since this chapter has dealt primarily with the individual and collective functioning of the associations, we shall examine some of the views of executives and staff at One Dupont Circle. Those individuals who participated in the interviews were extremely cooperative and provided

very insightful information. Obviously, there is no agreement on what One Dupont Circle is or should be, or what should be the role of the associations in any joint venture. Some groups have very little interest in cooperative agreements in order to "present a united front." An official of AAHE admits:

> We are not interested in cooperating with other associations when they want to speak as a unit on some particular issue. This is not our interest.

The same official, on the other hand, believes there are areas of higher education in which a joint study or exploration would benefit all parties. Such a position is not unusual for an individual membership-based association which deals with global aspects of higher education. It is also the sole organization which focuses attention upon curricular trends and instruction. As a result, specific issues may be contradictory to the divergent interests of various groups within the umbrella organization.

An official of the NASULGC, when asked about One Dupont Circle as a national center for influence replied:

> First of all, there is no "Center" for higher education. We are just a group of associations with a job to do who happen to be conveniently located at the same place.

Interestingly, the same official was obviously cognizant of the image One Dupont Circle has in different parts of the country. He stated emphatically that it was inappropriate

to dub One Dupont Circle as the "Vatican" for higher education. The official observed that he, as well as others, is aware of the need for better governmental relations, especially through more analysis of proposed legislation which could be made available to the various memberships. Moreover he added, "We must know what information Congress wants."

Agreeing with him was an official of the AACJC who admits there have been problems of unified and complementary action by the associations occupying One Dupont Circle. He expressed the hope and faith that relationships and communication would improve in the near future. He placed great confidence in the new Coordinating Committee, feeling cooperative programs will be advanced through better work of smaller groups of major associations. The mutual projects of the Coordinating Committee, in his opinion, will tend to foster greater cohesiveness and unity among the various associations during the immediate future when competition for memberships and external support will be great.

From an entirely different point of view, an official of the AASCU believes any effort to get associations at One Dupont Circle to present a unified action approach or to become a national center of influence is a waste of time. He maintains cooperation can be achieved only on a limited basis as in the past and only a few prestigious associations will be able to serve as "influence thrusts"

for the diversified community of higher education in the future. This is precisely what has been happening and thus he predicts preservation of the status quo. In this study there is not space enough to cover comments of all those interviewed; however a summary view of the functioning of associations may be gained from the comments of an executive of the American Council on Education during an orientation conference for the 1972-73 ACE Fellows. He observed "the community of higher education is substantially divided." The statement in itself served to reiterate the point that the National Center for Higher Education would naturally have some almost unsolvable problems. He also stated that his own organization as well as others had been either too defensive or had not provided strong enough leadership to amount to some significant response to recurring problems in the higher education field. He observed, as an example, that the first Newman Report received only a defensive response from One Dupont Circle.

The same official outlined the following as being prime objectives to be accomplished: (1) there should be greater capacity for formulating future goals for higher education; (2) there should be better communication with legislators; making sure they understand what higher education is doing and what colleges need; and (3) there should be a greater commitment of the diverse organizations and institutions to achieve a unity of purpose.

He believes too much attention has been directed to certain aspects of Congressional relations and not enough on relations with the Executive Branch, especially those who interpret what the Administration proposes. This fundamental responsibility has been one of the significant omissions of most all of the associations making up the National Center for Higher Education. In essence, this official is calling for the creation of better mutual understandings.

In this regard, it is appropriate here to return to the literature. In a most perceptive analysis of responsibilities of Washington associations, James N. Sites prescribes several steps needed to achieve good internal relations:

> Early in its development a Washington association must go through its own unique positioning discipline, and continually keep this up-dated if it is to operate effectively. Begin by listing contacts of real importance to objectives: key congressional committees and congressmen, government offices and regulators, other associations and corporate representatives, trade reporters, and general newsmen.[23]

In addition he adds:

> It is necessary for an association to be aware of the public implications of and means of coping with breaking Washington developments such as agency investigations and congressional hearings. Furthermore implementation of long range programs for

> building good will and support among capitol thought leaders and influence centers is paramount among the major activities of any Washington-based association or federation of associations.[24]

Therefore, it is clear that any association in order to achieve its stated goal and mission in Washington must adhere to carefully stated principles of interaction with constituencies. There must also be a high degree of sensitivity to these constituents and satisfactory mechanisms for response.

## CHAPTER IV

### One Dupont Circle: Others Look In

Now that we have provided a glimpse of how some within One Dupont Circle view themselves, we turn to other external influence centers . . .Congress, federal agencies and the membership constituents to see their view of the National Center for Higher Education. For the Washington-based associations, Congress and the federal agencies are the primary targets of "influence" and one of the primary reasons why the associations are located in the Capitol city. At the other end, the associations are dependent upon the input, assistance, cooperation, and confidence of their member constituents if they hope to be effective in serving as a communications bridge.

### Section I: Congressional Views

Congressman Emanuel Celler maintains pressure groups are an indispensable part of lawmaking. The legislator, in his view, is a message center through which pressure groups, as part of the electorate, make their wishes known which makes him dependent upon input from organizations such as those at One Dupont Circle.[25]

There are two primary pressure groups for higher education located in Washington. One is the U.S. Office of

Education, (and more recently the National Institute for Education [NIE]), exerting pressure to advance the policies and goals of the administration while the other is the voluntary associations as represented by the National Center for Higher Education.

Senator Harrison H. Williams, architect of the Comprehensive Community College Act of 1969 (which ultimately became the basis for Title X of the Higher Education Amendments of 1972), lamented the absence of a single central repository for dependable information on higher education. His criticism was directed toward the U.S. Office of Education, a target of other nationally prominent congressional leaders. Congresswoman Edith Green was critical of the absence of objective information within the USOE as well as the questionable practice of awarding contracts and grants without a viable data base.[26] It might be observed that such criticism of USOE has not fostered the most positive and open attitude of USOE officials toward NCHE which has been the alternative information resource used by Congress, limited as it is.

Unfortunately, the view of congressional staff members as well as congressmen themselves is not as enthusiastic and positive toward One Dupont Circle as we might hope. One staff member of the Senate's Labor and Public Welfare Committee, approached concerning the relationship between his committee and One Dupont Circle, retorted with this sharp reaction:

> I would rather not talk about it; what I would say you probably wouldn't be able to print.

Fortunately, his extreme reaction is atypical, but not entirely out of character with some statements or inferences made by other congressional aides. Often, such remarks were directed at specific associations at One Dupont Circle rather than at the total complex. This is in line with what has been stated earlier about relationships among associations. A staff member of the House Education and Labor Committee sums up this type of attitude as follows:

> It's hard to answer the questions as to how much influence One Dupont Circle has, since we have to speak about selected associations housed there. It is obvious that some of the associations of higher education are more effective in their communication with the various units of the legislative branch than others.

From a slightly different perspective comes these telling words which further substantiates the contention Washington-based associations still have a long way to go in improving communication. In a recent address before a national audience, U.S. Representative Albert H. Quie asked this probing question: "How representative are these Washington-based educators?"[27] He continued by saying:

> ...although some assume they speak for a broad segment of higher education, I am more inclined to accept their input as valuable information from one knowledgeable person. Hopefully, he bases his opinions on frequent feedback from the

> institutions he represents. Usually, however, these communications seem to be based on a sample of no more than a dozen or so conversations with individual campus leaders.[28]

He added that one must not rely too extensively on these Washington-based associations. Principally, he had two reasons in mind when making this assertion: 1) these organizations do not have a sufficient data base, and 2) a disproportionate percentage of the data presented is a reflection of the ideas of college and university presidents.[29] Furthermore, Congress is aware of the tendency of the associations to select institutional representatives "from the field" who mirror their position. In addition, the Honorable Mr. Quie is not too optimistic about the ability of higher education establishments to be more effective in the future. In a note of pessimism he concluded:

> Even now, when so many people in higher education recognize the problems of the last two years[30] and how ineffectual they were with the Congress, I don't see sufficient efforts to remedy this lack of communication.[31]

This comment was generated, in part, by the failure of NCHE organizations to use what information they had in several cases such as open admissions, student unrest, student financial aid, and so forth.

In an unpublished paper, the Minority Staff Director of the U.S. House Committee on Education and Labor is critical of the American Council on Education and other national

associations. He echoes similar sentiments to those of Representative Quie. Frankly, he admits:

> When I arrived on the Hill four years ago, I was given the advice to simply check with the American Council on Education whenever I needed input from the higher education community. Although I accepted that advice and have received invaluable assistance from ACE, it took only a few months to realize that it was a much too inadequate source. For one thing, ACE and the other major national associations with active federal liaison efforts represent almost exclusively the point of view of college presidents. It took more work to seek out thoughtful views from faculty, deans, students, trustees, state board members and staff, scholars in research centers, and others with personal experiences in the educational arena. We have also begun to involve business, labor, and community service organizations.

In essence, he maintained accurate information about the diverse groups labeled post-secondary education necessitate better communications with a wider array of educators and others interested in higher education with congressional leaders.

An aide for the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare observed:

> Some of the groups are coming around, though; they are hiring people who keep in touch with us and try to provide up-to-date information. The associations must become more active 'lobbyists' and stop being so passive.

He pointed out, "lobbying may be simply supplying information needed." Yet the aversion of One Dupont Circle to

acknowledged lobbying because of IRS 501 regulation is viewed by this aide as an excuse or defense mechanism to do nothing by many at One Dupont Circle.

A staff member of the House Education and Labor Committee probably gives a summary of what most of the interviewees said when he makes these two important points: 1) One Dupont Circle should be viewed as only one source of information from diverse groups, and 2) more research on legislative proposals is necessary in order to anticipate some of the problem areas. In other words, more meaningful and timely data needs to be made available. He cites as a case in point the Basic Opportunity Grants (BOG) program which was recently funded. He relates that since there was a probability that there would be a low level of financing for this program, someone or an association involved in higher education should have foreseen the problem of distribution of so little money and, consequently, should have been ready to respond with a probable solution. As it was, the initiative had to come from a senator who first recognized the problem. Specifically, it would appear that the higher education community, especially those segments which are represented at One Dupont Circle, reacted again out of crisis, without having adequately investigated the best possible alternatives.

Section II: Federal Agency Views

It is natural that the U.S. Office of Education be perceived as the major federal agency toward which influence would be directed. The NIE has not been in existence long

enough to get a picture of its role. Yet the organization of the Executive branch, including the "extra-arm" operating directly from the White House during the Nixon Administration has created a new arena for consideration. In general, the higher education community as represented through the voluntary associations has been viewed as relatively unimportant and ineffective.

An official of the U.S. Office of Education observed:

> The White House doesn't even acknowledge the existence of the USOE when it comes to establishing policy. Its respect and concern for One Dupont Circle is even lower than for the USOE.

A White House staff member for Robert Finch observed that the technique for developing policy by the President was to identify those individuals within the academic community whose philosophies were consistent with his. The same official observed that a study would be commissioned, authorizing separate and independent data collection without regard to USOE or One Dupont Circle. Furthermore, there is no longer high priority to place professional educators on such task forces. Members may be lawyers such as the Chairman of the National Commission on the Financing of Post-secondary Education or businessmen whose background in higher education is only peripheral.

Another official declared:

> If there were a way to measure the impact, I'd predict the Education Commission of

> the States has done more for higher education in the last five years than One Dupont Circle. And NCHEMS (National Center for Higher Education Management Systems) will have greater clout with Congress if it continues to mix policy politics with technical development of a uniform information system.

One Dupont Circle has not been perceived as exercising initiative in attempting to change the procedures or policies of the White House. Some of the association officials have stated that the Executive offices of the White House are dedicated to "punishing" higher education. As a result, they have been timid in attempting to influence that center of federal government.

A high official of the U.S. Office of Education declared:

> Some association officials at One Dupont Circle seem to be constantly antagonizing those in the various bureaus. Some liaison should be established with the White House. They have failed to do that.

The perception of One Dupont Circle by officials of the U.S. Office of Education varies according to the specific area of assigned responsibility and any correlation with a given national association within the National Center for Higher Education. An official responsible for community colleges noted:

> The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges has been a vital instrument for gaining attention and support for the two-year colleges. It is clearly the national spokesman for these institutions and I have been fortunate to have day-to-day cooperation with the staff.

> As far as One Dupont Circle being an influence center, I believe the diverse interests represented by the associations negate any possible unified voice. As a matter of fact, I am not sure that American higher education should have a single spokesman.

Several bureaus within the U.S. Office of Education have been criticized because of their possible favoritism to national associations at One Dupont Circle when awarding contracts and grants. Representative Edith Green has been a consistent critic of the administration of the grant program by the USOE. An official defends past decisions to make awards to the national associations in this way:

> On the one hand we need to avoid the image dictating the direction of higher education in America. On the other hand, we need to avoid criticism by congressmen that we favor one state over another. The associations enable us to award grants which cover a national membership and thus avoid a great deal of flack.

When questioned whether the associations might reflect favoritism, the official responded that such criticisms would be aimed at the association by their constituents and not at the USOE.

Several officials were concerned that One Dupont Circle often was unduly critical of the U.S. Office. Efforts to develop a comprehensive and uniform information system provoked considerable reaction. This might be a reflection of the friction which developed among USOE, NCHEMS, NCHE, and other national groups over proposed uniform taxonomies of

definitions, responsibility for data collection, storage, dissemination, and so forth. One official adamantly declared colleges and universities would be forced to produce comparable information to USOE in spite of actions by One Dupont Circle. It was interesting, however, that several individuals spoke of One Dupont Circle as though it were a single center.

Section III: Constituency Views

It is obviously impossible to be representative of views of constituent members of the various organizations located at One Dupont Circle. Nevertheless, the observations of H. S. Mersereau are cogent:

> The dues-paying members of associations are consciously examining the worth of associations right now and their conclusions, whether they are based on fact or fancy, will determine the worth, in fact the very existence, of many of these groups tomorrow.[32]

Perceived shortcomings of the USOE motivate membership in associations within One Dupont Circle according to some. An official of a public university stated:

> While I am forced to deal with the bureaucracy represented by USOE, I do not have to belong to a national association which cannot represent our best interests in Congress. There is no reason why we should not be able to be as effective in higher education as the union movement or the manufacturer's groups or any others who are able to present a united front on major issues before the Congress.

A dean of a four-year college has a different view of the purpose of One Dupont Circle. He stated:

> I look to my professional association as a way to keep abreast of the latest practices and to improve myself professionally. I believe we give too much attention to the responsibility of the association in the area of lobbying and grantsmanship and not enough in the area of professional growth and development.

An official of a state association responsible for two-year colleges observed:

> The new depression of higher education will force greater service and responsiveness from the national associations. They, as institutions, will either produce or fade out of existence.

The economic problems confronting associations have contributed to another problem area. Membership dues rarely provide enough to maintain a Washington staff and office. Survival often depends upon the success of an association to generate additional funding through grants and contracts. In pursuing this direction, several associations have inadvertently become competitors to their constituent members.

The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges recently undertook an ambitious reorganization in an effort to be an umbrella association for the various interests within the two-year college field. Special interest groups have been encouraged to affiliate through councils. These councils represent such diverse interests as state directors of two-

year colleges, minority groups, business officers, trustees, college and university professors, independent two-year colleges, and presidents. One professor observed:

> Some council members will probably wake up to the fact that they are supporting an organization which is contributing to their own future demise. On the one hand we are asked to be dues-paying members of the council for professors only to see the AACJC turn to outside consulting organizations to use as part of their in-service training programs for presidents, faculty groups, and others. In their zeal to increase council membership, they have failed even to consider the potential benefit of using "in house" expertise from the membership to accomplish their goals.

It is apparent that such criticism is partially due to lack of planning on the part of associations which often are accused of having poorly defined purposes and hazy objectives. One writer notes:

> Many associations now find their own position being assailed from several directions. They complain that they are unjustly accused of "spiraling membership costs," "overlapping functions," and "resistance to change." Rather than retreating to a defensive position, it is time for associations to take to the offense. One of the ways is through long-range planning.[33]

In general, individuals canvassed as part of this study were positive toward their own membership in a national association. High esteem was expressed for the staff of the associations who were seen as "national leaders" whose influence in the direction of American higher education has

been and continues to be substantial. The view of One Dupont Circle as a national influence center, however, was more in a symbolic sense rather than in concrete terms. One university administrator observed:

> I never fail to be fascinated by a visit to Washington, D.C. It is a moving experience and I cannot help but feel that I am walking at the very center of our country and feel vibrations of power and majesty. And when I visit One Dupont Circle, I have the same sensation of excitement. I wish I were able to visit every office and get to know every official of every association located there.

In summary, different perceptions exist according to the relationship between outside constituent and One Dupont Circle. While Congress has turned to the NCHE on occasions (often when USOE has failed to deliver needed information) and while the NCHE has taken initiative from time to time on matters before Congress, a more deliberate and consistent lobbying program is needed. Congressmen, including their aides, expect such efforts as a normal function of Washington-based organizations. The fact NCHE has been more effective than USOE during several critical legislative sessions has contributed to a somewhat hostile view from some federal officials. Others, though, have used NCHE as a resource center which has been quite productive. The latter situation is often due to individuals establishing a positive working relationship on a personal diplomacy basis. Finally, while some dues-paying members of various organizations expressed unhappiness with the perceived

benefits of such membership, One Dupont Circle generally symbolizes the national center of activities to professionals and other institutional representatives.

## CHAPTER V

### One Dupont Circle: A Clearer Perspective

A serious analysis of the connotation of One Dupont Circle as the national influence center for higher education leads to a conclusion that the vision may be a mirage. Furthermore, it may be fortunate such an illusion exists rather than the reality of a central power which would result in the existence of a structure we historically sought to avoid. If the assumption of the American ideal to avoid a national ministry of education is correct, then we probably should avoid a single influence center which could result in the same consequences. Representative Albert H. Quie notes:

> Another problem of the organized higher education lobbyists is their natural desire to present a "united front" to the Congress. Indeed, many individual congressmen ask the associations how the Congress is to make policy decisions on higher education legislation when the major associations cannot even agree. It puts the associations in a difficult position. I am one who expects the associations to work together on major policy questions, but I do not expect, for example, the Association of American Universities to agree with the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges on every issue. ...We want to understand those differences so the Congress can decide, not some small group at One Dupont Circle, what is good public

> policy. Perhaps even more important than the efforts of associations is what happens between individual congressmen and their constituents back home.[34]

Thus, while the various associations located at One Dupont Circle are interdependent, they are not equally dependent on each other. If we think of the collectivity of associations at One Dupont Circle, it is understandable that the nature of a given issue will determine the degree of cooperation and the coalition requirements involved in the specific political process. In this regard, it is appropriate to note Kahn's differentiation between power and influence:

> There is in effect a continuum of sanctions...one may wish to distinguish between power and influence in the terms of its continuum; that is, according to the amount of pressure one is really able to bring to bear on the target of his influence. If it is only a little bit, one speaks of influencing; if it is a good deal, one speaks of exercising power; and whether it is a little or a good deal is then relative to the state of affairs.[35]

Organizations at One Dupont Circle, as such, can probably be described as exerting some influence. When they are part of a total commitment through the involvement of all higher education institutions and groups, it can be said that the higher education community is exercising power.

Despite the claims of the Washington-based associations that they provide real services, apparently there is an inability of many associations to meet expectations of some of their constituents. This is not entirely the fault of the

individual associations, since much of the planning and programming is dependent upon foundation or government support. From an examination of the budgets of one of the larger associations, it is apparent that only a small percentage of the budget comes from membership dues or assessments--in this case, less than one-fourth. Such a sum would barely take care of the high rent, overhead, and expenses for a modest office staff. As anyone who is familiar with foundations knows, priorities of the foundation and those of the fund-seeking organization rarely match. At best, if funding becomes a reality, there is a compromised proposal which emerges. Often the grant contains no provision for overhead which must then be absorbed by a contingency account, if there is one. The association headquarters may be quite interested in carrying out certain specified member objectives; however, either the individual members are not willing to assume the additional cost or the foundation or government agency is unwilling to expend funds on the idea or on something which does not have significance to them. Of late, there has been greater difficulty in getting any foundation support--the seekers outnumber the resources. Notwithstanding, associations at One Dupont Circle must be prepared for the continuing challenges of change which will confront them during the last three decades of this century.

While a united front is desirable most times, it is obvious after looking at the varied objectives of the individual associations that such an action, at times, may be neither

appropriate nor desirable. Now, however, the emerging pressures and attacks upon the entire higher education community demand a new kind of cooperation or a new generation of associations. We anticipate the former rather than the latter course of action.

It should not be assumed that associations at One Dupont Circle would have all objectives and priorities consonant with those of Washington lawmakers or federal agency officials. This would, in some sense, negate the real purpose of the higher education establishment at One Dupont Circle. And, of course, this is not the real issue. Rather, the appropriate concern of the named influence centers is the acquisition of timely, up-to-date data regarding higher education issues, sometimes resulting in legislation on policy determination.

Also, the suggestion by several that there be more effective liaison with the Executive branch may remain more a cherished ideal than a realization at present. Currently, there is no one permanently on the Executive staff primarily responsible for higher education matters; this gives us some hint as to the priority, or lack thereof, that it has. Some have hailed the Higher Education Amendments of 1972, which the President reluctantly signed into law, as perhaps the last higher education legislation of consequence to be passed for some time to come.

Aside from the political consequences, what can be ascertained from the comments of knowledgeable observers regarding the position of One Dupont Circle as a national influence

center? First, the critical comments form an analysis of the issues, problems, probable solutions and prospects for the future. Secondly, there must be a reexamination of relationships--both internal and external--by the collective associations. There are even areas of exploration which could lead to an improved image and improved effectiveness.

There is an urgent need for the associations at One Dupont Circle to take their proper place in the political arena; they can barely afford the luxury of taking a neutral role or retreating to a defensive position when called upon to take a firm position regarding higher education policy matters. Moreover, these organizations, collectively, must become more perceptive about their impact on other influence centers, including but not limited to the Congress, federal agencies, ancillary organizations, and proprietary groups.

As to the politicization of the higher education establishment, Bloland states:

> . . .associations have been, particularly in the 1960s, very directly engaged in political activity. . . In addition, there has been a tendency in the 1960s for associations to play an increasingly important role as links between the academic community and the federal government, and, in fact, to serve as vehicles for the expression of academic views on public policy.[36]

In essence, Bloland stresses the ambivalence of higher educational organizations to the politicization process; he indicates that although the voluntary associations are already political, they have difficulty deciding to what degree the

involvement should be.[37] At most, the efforts of these associations to achieve an effective voice in shaping public policy directly affecting their primary purposes may be viewed as narrow politicization. There is no concensus on the extent to which associations should be involved in political activity, however. Bloland observes:

> The impetus to use associations as vehicles for the articulation of member views on broad political issues grows out of a deep concern among some members of these organizations that scientific specialization--and the extensive ties between academic institutions and the federal government--have subverted the traditional and potential role of higher education organizations as the locus of vital social and political criticism.[38]

Another area for higher education associations which must be cleared up relates to their apparent misinterpretation of "lobbying." Associations at One Dupont Circle, as elsewhere, are always rationalizing inaction by stating they are limited because they may be accused of "lobbying" as a not-for-profit organization. The Law of Associations[39] advises that this is a troublesome area of associations because "the present concept of lobbying lies in the difficulty to distinguish between 'influencing' and 'informing' Congressmen. Associations are collectors of information from various sources; therefore, they also distribute it to members and others who have interest in it."[40] Consequently, the issue is not "lobbying" per se, but the purveyance of information which is timely and pertinent to formulation of higher education policy.

Finally, associations often find themselves the target of criticism because of lack of planning, poorly defined purposes, hazy objectives, failing to provide the services members need, and being reluctant to change. We believe solutions can be found for these problems. Charles Lindblom makes the following assertion which serves well as a concluding note:

> In the United States some groups of half a dozen citizens, if they try with vigor, can count on influencing federal government policy; and, unless they can be dismissed as eccentric, or suffer from incompetent leadership, members of any group as large as a hundred can count, at least, on having some agency, executive, legislator, or party leader give careful regard to their wishes beyond politely listening to what they have to say. Still, it is impossible...to be precise about their effect.[41]

## REFERENCES


1. Dexter, Lewis A. Elite and Specialized Interviewing. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1970, pp. 5-8.

2. Cheit, Earl F. The New Depression in Higher Education: A Study at 41 Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.

3. National Center for Higher Education. A brochure published by the American College Public Relations Association, Summer, 1972.

4. Ibid.

5. Education Directory, Part IV, "Educational Associations," U.S. Office of Education. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972.

6. Caplow, Theodore. Principles of Organization. Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1964, p. 174.

7. U.S. Department of the Treasury. Internal Revenue Code of 1954, Section 501 (c) (3). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1954.

8. Pennock, J. Roland, Voluntary Associations. New York: Atherton Press, 1964.

9. Ibid.

10. Ibid.

11. American Society of Association Executives. Report, A Look at Associations. Washington, D.C.: ASAE, 1970.

12. Haas, Eugene J. and Drabek, Thomas E. Complex Organizations: A Sociological Perspective. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1973, p. 205.

13. Pennock, Ibid.

14. Dexter, Lewis Anthony. How Organizations Are Represented in Washington. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1964, p. 2.

15. Ibid., p. 42.

16. Haas and Drabek, p. 229.

17. Ibid., p. 230.

18. National Center for Higher Education. A brochure published by the American College Public Relations Association, Summer, 1972, p. 2.

19. National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. Facts. Washington, D.C.: NASULGC, 1973.

20. American Association of State Colleges and Universities. Directory. Washington, D.C.: AASCU, 1973.

21. Association of American Colleges. Directory. Washington, D.C.: AAC, 1973.

22. Association of American Universities. Unpublished Document, Washington, D.C.: AAU, 1972. (Mimeographed.)

23. Sites, James N. "PR in Washington," Association Management, (December, 1971), pp. 39.

24. Ibid., p. 40-41.

25. Celler, Emanuel, "Pressure Groups in Congress," In Pressure Groups in American Politics (H. R. Mahood, Ed.). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1967, pp. 231-243.

26. Green, Edith, "Education's Federal Grab Bag," The Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 54, No. 2 (October, 1972), pp. 83-86.

27. Quie, A. H. Honorable, Unpublished Address. U.S. House of Representatives, 1973. (Mimeographed.)

28. Ibid.

29. Ibid.

30. Representative Quie is referring to the Higher Education Amendments of 1972.

31. Quie, Ibid.

32. American Society for Association Executives. "What Are Associations Really Worth . . . Today? Tomorrow?," In Association Management, (October, 1965), p. 36.

33. American Society for Association Executives. "Long Range Planning for Associations," In Association Management, (February, 1967), p. 18.

34. Quie, op. cit.

35. Kahn, Robert L. Power and Conflict in Organizations. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1964, p. 13.

36. Bloland, Harland. "Politicization of Higher Education," In Current Issues in Higher Education (Edited by G. K. Smith). Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1969.

37. Ibid.

38. Ibid.

39. Oleck, H. L. "Federal Taxation: Charitable Organizations," In Voluntary Associations (Edited by George D. Webster), Washington, D.C.: American Society of Association Executives, 1971.

40. Ibid.

41. Lindblom, Charles E. The Intelligence of Democracy. New York: The Free Press, 1965.

## NOTES ON THE AUTHORS

Louis W. Bender is Professor of Higher Education at the Florida State University. He directs the FSU Center for State and Regional Leadership which is supported in part by a grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. Lou served as State Director for Community Colleges for five years and Assistant Commissioner for Higher Education for two years in Pennsylvania before coming to FSU in 1970. He has served on several commissions of the AACJC and AAHE. He is a member of several other associations located at One Dupont Circle. He received his doctorate at Lehigh University in 1965.

Howard L. Simmons is an advanced doctoral student at the Florida State University, currently on leave from Northampton County Area Community College in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. He holds a master's degree in Slavic Languages and Literatures with a major in Russian from the University of Indiana. Simmons most recently served as a Fellow of the American Council on Education with the AACJC in Washington, D.C. He has previously served as faculty member and administrator in the Junior College District of St. Louis and has been active in higher education affairs of several organizations located at One Dupont Circle.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

## Publications of the FSU Center for State and Regional Leadership (Since 1972)

| TITLE | AUTHOR | DATE |
|---|---|---|
| Management Concepts and Higher Education | Louis W. Bender and Richard C. Richardson, Jr. | May, 1972 |
| A Statewide Study: Identified Problems of International Students Enrolled In Public Community/Junior Colleges in Florida | Robert L. Breuder | May, 1972 |
| Reorganizing For the Second Decade: Department of Community Colleges of the State Board of Education of North Carolina | Ben E. Fountain, Jr. | May, 1972 |
| A Proposal For a Management Information System and a Planning, Programming, Budgeting System for the Regional Community Colleges of Connecticut | Searle F. Charles | July, 1972 |
| Danger: Will External Degrees Reincarnate Bogus Degree Mills? A Challenge to State and National Agencies | Louis W. Bender and James A. Davis | July, 1972 |
| Content Analysis As a Research Tool For Higher Education | Melvene Draheim Hardee, Editor | August, 1972 |
| A Master Plan For Unit Cost Among Community Junior Colleges | Howard D. Sims | August, 1972 |
| A Funding Model For Community College Operating Costs | Clement Lausberg | August, 1972 |
| Proceedings of a National Invitation Conference on Post-Secondary Career Education For State Directors of Vocational Education, Community/ Junior Colleges, Adult & Continuing Education | FSU/UF Center for State and Regional Leadership and The Center for Vocational and Technical Education (Ohio State U.), Cosponsors | January 18-20, 1973 |
| First-Level Management: Legal Implications and Responsibilities for Selection and Retention of Faculty | Department of Higher Education, Florida State University | February, 1973 |
| Organizing the Alabama State Junior College System for the Seventies | E. B. Moore, Jr. | April, 1973 |
| A Plan For Planning For a State Community College System | Lee G. Henderson | June, 1973 |
| A Nationwide Study: State-Level Coordination of Student Personnel Services in Community Junior Colleges | George A. Schmidt, Jr. | June, 1973 |
| Long-Range Planning For Community College Education | John C. Mundt | July, 1973 |
| Proceedings of Twelfth Annual Summer Workshop, Southeastern Community College Leadership Program | Joyce Clampitt, Editor | July 18-20, 1973 |
| Institutional Responsibility in the Development of Faculty Dismissal Criteria | H. M. Holderfield and Frank D. Brown | August, 1973 |
| California Views Toward Statewide Governance of Community Colleges | Sidney W. Brossman | September, 1973 |
| One Dupont Circle: National Influence Center for Higher Education | Louis W. Bender and Howard L. Simmons | November, 1973 |
| Articulation of Post-Secondary Programs in Occupational Education | E. B. Moore, Jr. | November, 1973 |

Complimentary copies of all publications are sent to State Directors of Community/Junior Colleges, University Libraries, National Organizations, and the ERIC Clearinghouse at UCLA. Individual copies may be ordered. A Charge of $2.50 for each monograph ordered is necessary to cover printing and mailing costs. Checks should be made out to Florida State University.